

Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County
Trial Division - Civil
TRIAL WORK SHEET

Judge's Name:	Judge's I.D.:	Signature:
DANIEL J ANDERS	J461	


Caption:	Case Type:	Program:
MESIGIAN ETAL VS ETHICON WOMEN'S HEALTH AND UROLOG	MT - PELVIC MESH	MASS TORT

Court Term and Number:	If Consolidated, Court Term and Number:
#1402-00399	

Trial Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jury <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Jury	Total Amount:	Number of Days:	Disposition Date:	Date Sheet Prepared:
04-APR-2019		\$80,025,000.00	37	17-MAY-2019	17-MAY-2019

Full Description of Disposition (to be entered Verbatim on the Docket)

The jury returned a verdict (1) in favor of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian and against the Defendants for \$30,000,000 in compensatory damages and \$50,000,000 in punitive damages and (2) in favor of Plaintiff George Mesigian and against the Defendants for \$25,000.

<input type="checkbox"/> Default Judgment/Court Ordered <input type="checkbox"/> Directed Verdict <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuance Ordered <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred to binding arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> Finding for Defendant (Non-Jury) <input type="checkbox"/> Finding for Plaintiff (Non-Jury) <input type="checkbox"/> Damages Assessed <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment entered by agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment entered <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment satisfied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jury Verdict for Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> Jury Verdict for Defendant <input type="checkbox"/> Mistrial <input type="checkbox"/> Hung Jury <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Pros entered <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Suit entered <input type="checkbox"/> Settled prior to assignment for trial (Team Leaders, only) <input type="checkbox"/> Settled after assignment for trial <input type="checkbox"/> prior to jury selection <input type="checkbox"/> after jury sworn	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) Mesigian Etal Vs Ethico-WSJVP  14020039900304 DOCKETED COMPLEX LIT CENTER MAY 20 2019 J. STEWART
---	---	--

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
TRIAL DIVISION - CIVIL

PATRICIA MESIGIAN and GEORGE : Case No. 140200399
MESIGIAN :
VS. :
ETHICON INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON :
:

VERDICT SHEET

QUESTION #1:

Did Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian file her lawsuit within the statute of limitations?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2.

If you answer "No" to Question 1, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #2:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that the Prolift was defective under the "Consumer Expectations" test?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3.

If you answer "No" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 4.

QUESTION #3:

Was the defect you found in the Prolift under the "Consumer Expectations" test a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4.

If you answer "No" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4.

QUESTION #4:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that the Prolift was defective under the "Risk/Utility" test?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5.

If you answer "No" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.

QUESTION #5:

Was the defect you found in the Prolift under the "Risk/Utility" test a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ✓ NO

Please proceed to Question 6.

QUESTION #6:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that Defendants failed to adequately warn about the risks of the Prolift?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 6, please proceed to Question 7.
If you answer "No" to Question 6 but answered "Yes" to either Question 3 or 5, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 6 and answered "No" to Question 3 and 5, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #7:

Do you find that Defendants' failure to adequately warn about the risks of the Prolift was a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 7, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 7, but answered "Yes" to either Question 3 or 5, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 7 and answered "No" to Questions 3 and 5, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #8

State the total amount of compensatory damages sustained by Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian as a result of the defects and/or Defendants' failure to warn that you found.

\$ 30 million

Please proceed to Question 9.

QUESTION #9:

Do you find that Plaintiff George Mesigian proved that he suffered a loss of consortium?

YES ✓ NO _____

If you answer "Yes" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 10.

If you answer "No" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 11.

QUESTION #10

State the total amount of compensatory damages, if any, sustained by Plaintiff George Mesigian as a result of the loss of consortium.

\$ 25, thousand

Please proceed to Question 11.

QUESTION #11:

Based upon the instruction given to you by the Court, do you find that punitive damages should be awarded?

YES ✓ NO _____

If you answer "Yes" to Question 11, please proceed to Question 12.

If you answer "No" to Question 11, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #12

State the amount of punitive damages that you award.

\$ 50 million

Final Instructions

Please note that at least 10 of 12 jurors must agree with the answer to each question on this Verdict Sheet. They do not need to be the same 10 of 12 jurors for each question.

TAWANDA IXIAM
JURY FOREPERSON

Date: 5-17-19